R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 365 AC 000 558

POLITICS OF UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL CHANGE.

BY- CAMPBELL, ALAN K.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUC. FOR ADULTS
REPORT NUMBER NOTES AND ESSAYS-53-3 PUB DATE 67
EDRS PRICE HC-$0.72 18P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SOCIAL CHANGE, *UNIVERSITIES, *COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, *PUBLIC POLICY, *COMMUNITY ROLE, POWER STRUCTURE, POLITICAL POWER, PLURALISM, DECISION MAKING, SOCIAL PLANNING, CHANGE AGENTS, LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY, BOSTON

THE AUTHOR DISCUSSES THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE IN SOCIAL CHANGE FROM THE POLITICAL VIEWPOINT. BY EXAMINING OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM AS IT RELATED TO UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT, HE INDICATES THE POLITICAL RAMIFICATIONS OF SUCH INVOLVEMENT AND SHOWS THE KIND OF INVOLVEMENT THAT IS POLITICALLY POSSIBLE. HE PINPOINTS THE DIFFICULTIES CIVIC ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL HAVE IN WORKING TOGETHER AS PROBLEMS OF APPROACH. UNIVERSITIES TEND TO DEFINE PROBLEMS WITHIN THEIR MORE GENERAL CONTEXT AND TO ESPOUSE LONG-RANGE PLANNING, WHILE OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM IS PRIMARILY CONDUCIVE TO SMALL INCREMENTAL CHANGE AND SHORT-RANGE PLANNING. THE AUTHOR STATES THAT THIS POLITICAL SITUATION EXISTS BECAUSE OF (1) OUR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CHANGE, (2) OUR IDEOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, WHICH IS BASED IN GOOD PART ON LAISSEZ FAIRE, (3) OUR POWER STRUCTURE, WHICH IS PLURALISTIC, AND (4) OUR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. ALTHOUGH THE SYSTEM IN SOME WAYS AGREES WITH THE UNIVERSITY, IT ALSO PRODUCES MANY FRUSTRATIONS. THESE FRUSTRATIONS ARE AN INEVITABLE PART OF THE SYSTEM, UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IS NONETHELESS NECESSARY AND MUST CONTINUE. THE COMPLETE DOCUMENT, "POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF ADULT EDUCATION, THE UNIVERSITY IN URBAN SOCIETY," IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION OF ADULTS AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY, 138 MOUNTFORT ST., BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS 02146, FOR $1.25. (EB)

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS 53

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

POLITICAL BACKGROUNDS OF ADULT EDUCATION

The University of Durham Institute

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

AC 000 558 ED011365

CENTER *for the* STUDY
OF LIBERAL EDUCATION
FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, *Clark University*
JAMES T. CAREY, *University of California*
JOHN P. DYER, *Tulane University*
CYRIL O. HOULE, *University of Chicago*
H. LICHTENSTEIN, *Hofstra College*
JACK LONDON, *University of California*
ERNEST E. MCMAHON, *Rutgers University*
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, *New York University*
ALAN M. THOMAS, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*
CLIFFORD L. WINTERS, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, and *Occasional Papers*.

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS *AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY*
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

$1.75

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY James B. Whipple

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

POLITICS OF UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL CHANGE

by

Alan K. Campbell

Campbell discusses the university's role in social change from the political viewpoint. By examining our political system as it relates to university involvement, he indicates the political ramifications of such involvement and shows the kind of involvement that is politically possible. He pinpoints the difficulties civic administrators and university personnel have in working together as problems of approach: universities tend to define problems within their more general context and to espouse long-range planning, while our political system is primarily conducive to small incremental change and short-range planning. This political bias exists because of (1) our lack of knowledge about the causes and consequences of change; (2) our ideological environment, which is based in good part on laissez faire; (3) our power structure, which is pluralistic; and (4) our decision-making process. Although the system in some ways agrees with the university, it also produces many frustrations. These frustrations are an inevitable part of the system; university involvement is nonetheless necessary and must continue.

Alan K. Campbell is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Metropolitan Studies Program of the Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University. He has served as Deputy Comptroller for Administration in the State of New York and consultant to the State Commission on the Governmental Operations of the City of New York. Dr. Campbell is currently a member of a commission to simplify the state constitution.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AC 000 558

POLITICS OF UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL CHANGE

The Concept of University Involvement

This paper deals with three broad subjects: politics, universities, and social change. Because it is impossible to discuss these topics with any kind of completeness here, I shall deal with them only within a limited framework.

The concept of university involvement will be defined and related to what political scientists think they know about social change. Consequently it should be possible to indicate the political ramifications of such involvement and thereby the kind of involvement which is politically possible.

To understand university involvement requires a knowledge of the many and various roles a university plays in modern society. All institutions in contemporary society are complex, but perhaps the most complex are universities. There are many ways in which parts of a university or university personnel may be involved in social change. To help clarify the kind of university involvement I am discussing, I shall first indicate the types with which I am not concerned.

A university administration, for example, has a stake in the ongoing social system since the institution it administers is a part of that system. It will be concerned with such local government matters as zoning and building-code enforcement, with such national matters as legislation that provides financial aid to institutions, and with a variety of state bodies that have power relative to the university. In these situations the administration acts like any other interest group. It defines and tries to protect institutional stakes. In doing so it may have the support of its faculty and students, but this role is only incidental to promoting social change and, therefore, is not of concern here.

Similarly, individual faculty members may become involved in promoting social change in ways which are only peripheral to their institutional affiliation. As scholars and teachers they may exert considerable influence on public thinking, and as participants in community and political affairs they may play a significant public role. They do this, however, not as representatives of their institutions but as experts in a particular

field. The direction of the social change which these activities promote is not necessarily consistent with the direction desired by the university administration. Nevertheless, although the administration may attempt to limit faculty activities, it cannot enforce institutional loyalty. This independent role of the scholar in promoting social change, albeit important, does not fit the concept of university involvement used here.

Like the administration or the faculty, the student body may also attempt to bring about social change. The participation of a large number of students in the Civil Rights movement, for example, has certainly played an important role in the momentous social changes which that movement has accomplished. Such student involvement, however, is not university-sponsored and only indirectly university-inspired.

The kind of university involvement with which I am concerned is that which grows out of the mobilization of some part of the university's resources to attack a social problem. The techniques which may be used to accomplish this mobilization include sponsored research, training programs, and demonstration projects. Financing may be internal or external. Nearly all such activities require some form of administrative approval of the project and therefore involve some degree of institutional commitment. But such a commitment does not include any implication of university approval of the findings. The public finds this aspect of university involvement particularly difficult to understand. Although reports and other products of such activities carry the university name, they do not involve university approval. The relationship is a complex one and leads to many problems, some of which are discussed below.

It is within the context of this type of university involvement that one must analyze the politics of university involvement in social change. The issues revolve around the extent to which the university can be effective in its social change role and the consequences such a role carries for the university. In order to examine both effectiveness and consequences, it is necessary to understand something about social change itself. The process of change must also be understood if the decision points in the system are to be effectively identified and manipulated.

The Nature of Social Change

For the student of social behavior, an analysis of social change requires, first, an understanding of change. It is impossible to plan change

or, more realistically, to direct and control it, if the process and determinants of change are not understood.

Although the understanding of change is a central concern of every social scientist, no generally accepted theoretical social system has successfully incorporated change determinants. Most of us are still trying to understand the relationships and interactions of variables in a static system. There is, in fact, a question whether change can be incorporated into a social system model since change implies a new or different set of relationships which upset the model, or which at least cause it to alter direction or move to another level of performance.

The difficulty lies in predicting the impact of change on all the interrelated variables which constitute the system. Such theoretical difficulties do not stand in the way of interpreting the causes and consequences of change after it has occurred. The problem lies in understanding the dynamics of change sufficiently to permit effective participation in the process and to understand the political consequences of that participation.

The problem of dealing with change is related not only to the inherent problems in theory-model-building but to the concept of change as well. It is not very satisfactory or useful to discuss change in general or abstract terms. Its possible meanings are too numerous and the range in degree of change too wide to make it a sufficiently precise concept for analytical purposes.

Obviously changes can differ in depth and in speed. At one extreme is the transformation of society, the tearing up of a social order by its roots, a change accompanied by disorder and violence—a revolution. Even revolutions, however, differ. The American Revolution brought great political change but did not fundamentally alter the country's social and economic system, while the Russian Revolution brought basic changes to all aspects of that society.

At the other end of the change continuum is the kind of change which does not disrupt society, but which alters its course by some degree. In the short run such change may appear slight, but in the long run it can bring about fundamental alterations in society. For example, the adoption of government guarantees of housing mortgages in the 1930's was not considered by many as fundamentally altering any aspect of Ameri-

can society; but this policy certainly aided, even if it did not cause, the suburbanization of America in the 1950's. On the other hand, other efforts to bring about more basic changes or to control changes considered undesirable have had little or no impact.

It is, perhaps, of some interest that the kinds of changes which have produced the more general theories have been the drastic changes, the revolutionary alterations in societal structure. These theories have not been the product of the contemporary political scientist, economist, or sociologist, but of the more grandiose social scientists and historians. From the historians we have the cyclical theory of Vico, the inevitable decline theory of Spengler, and the single factor causative theory of Toynbee; from the general social scientist we have, most notably, the revolutionary doctrine of Marx and the gradual but inevitable progress concept of Condorcet.

These broad sweeping generalizations about the causes of change meet with little favor today. The contemporary social scientist finds them insufficiently supported by empirically based evidence. Concerned with the reliability and validity of his findings, the contemporary social scientist is struggling to discover and apply new techniques of research and analysis. The result is investigations of social phenomena that are based on careful observations, full and accurate collection of data, detailed classification, and a cautious statement of findings. Such self-imposed methodological limitations narrow substantially the range of behavior which can be subject to analysis.

But even these limitations are not considered sufficient by some scholars, usually called the behavioralists. In describing the view of this group in a United Nations publication on the study of the teaching of political science in the United States, Dwight Waldo explains: "They are devoted to a very strict interpretation of the meaning of science. The focus of their attention is sharply on 'what can be observed'—the behavior of humans. The distinguishing or characteristic features of the behavioral approach are: an attempt to avoid all 'oughts,' care in the formulation of hypotheses, preoccupation with fashioning analytical 'models', meticulous attention for leaving a trail that can be followed—'replication'—and caution in conclusions drawn from particular studies together with the expectation of an every growing body of established generalizations."

Some social scientists would argue that these methodological limita-

tions are too strict, that they stand in the way of the analysis and examination of many quite legitimate areas of interest. Methodology, they argue, becomes the criterion for selection of areas of study rather than the relevance and importance of questions and issues on which the social scientist wishes to shed light.

It is not my intention to become embroiled in this dispute, but rather to offer it as at least a partial explanation of why most modern-day social scientists do not spend their time spinning out grandiose theories of change—such theories simply do not meet the criteria of science followed even by the "soft" scientists within the profession. I offer this background, too, to provide at least part of the general context in which the modern-day social scientist studies the dynamics of change and the political possibility of directing, controlling, or planning that change.

The state of knowledge concerning the dynamics of social change has important implications for university involvement in such change. Since it is but imperfectly understood, efforts to promote change may produce unintended consequences. These consequences may not serve the university's interest. If the changes which emerge or are advocated were always predictable, it would obviously be easier for university officials to decide whether the university should become involved.

It is clear that all universities as institutions have a sufficient stake in society so that they will not become involved in promoting revolutionary change. Again, individual faculty members and even organized faculty groups, as well as individual students and organized student groups, may become involved in accomplishing such change. But not the university as an institution.

Therefore it is necessary, in discussing university involvement, to examine what is known about less grandiose change—incremental change. Perhaps in this field the social scientist can provide some help in understanding the politics of university involvement. Analyses of how the political process works, how political power is distributed, and how political decisions are made all provide hints and illustrations relevant to understanding incremental change. Are the institutions, processes, and power ingredients of this system likely to aid or hinder university involvement in such change? To answer this question I will examine the relevance to social change of ideological environment, the power structure and the decision process of American government and politics. In this context so-

cial change involves planning, since involvement in social change carries with it the implication of planning such change.

The Ideological Environment for Social Change

In an earlier period the political scientist participated in the great debate in the Western world about whether, in fact, social planning was consistent with a liberal democratic society. In historical terms planning as an issue is a modern phenomenon. It would not have occurred to Aristotle, perhaps the first political scientist, to have questioned the right of government to plan. Rather, he saw the state as the chief means for the realization of the good life. The state was all-inclusive. It was made up of a pattern of institutions which included the family, village, town, and state. It was through the state that ethics were derived and human life was given meaning. As a part of the state, institutions of learning had the obligations to improve the state.

The development of Western civilizations tended to relegate the state and universities to a much narrower sphere. In fact, liberty and freedom were primarily thought of as freedom from state control. There also developed a positive concept of non-interference by the state in the economic field based on the doctrine of laissez faire and the guidance of the economy by an invisible hand. A guidance which worked for the benefit of all, if left alone.

In no country was the doctrine of laissez faire accepted as wholeheartedly as it was in the United States. As Louis Hartz so well explained, neither the paternalism of the Tory nor the noblesse oblige of the upper class had an appreciable impact on American thought or practice. With no feudal system to overthrow, Americans did not carry any fundamental class division into modern society—there was no class and few institutional walls in the way of the full development of liberal institutions and practices. This combination of factors prevented the development of an ideological base in favor of planning social change. This lack of an ideological base for social planning affected all institutions in society including universities. Planning was rejected in America as being inconsistent with the liberal concept of the proper relation between citizen and state. No political party in this country has ever made planning a central doctrine in its platform. Nor have those minor parties which have espoused planning been able to gain the status of major parties.

Despite the ideological rejection of planning, its practice has become increasingly important in the public sector of the American economy. This planning is pragmatically rather than ideologically oriented and has developed in response to the social and economic problems produced by industrialization, economic cycles, urbanization, and the closing of the frontier. Such problems have led to political demands for reform but these reforms were not necessarily consistent with each other. There were at least three different approaches to reform. One of these, demanding simply that laissez faire be made to work, resulted in legislation primarily in the field of anti-trust. Another demanded political reform, and out of this demand grew the primary, the referendum, the initiative and reorganization of the executive branches of state and local government. Finally, the third approach insisted that the state should play a more positive role in the solving of social problems.

Therefore planning has come to play a role (although not a comprehensive one) in the public sector of the economy. It is usually a response to specific problems brought about by change rather than an effort to accomplish change.

In general, the ideological environment for planning is not hostile, but is not positively favorable either. Planning in the abstract has little support, but in concrete problem areas is readily accepted. This ideological environment surrounding the planning of social change has at least two important implications for university involvement. The first relates to the kind of assistance sought by institutions outside of the university: governments and foundations, for example. Operating in a pragmatic, problem-oriented society, the external groups will come to the university for help in solving specific problems. The problems are defined by the external agencies and not by the university. But these are not necessarily the problems which the experts on the university faculty think are important; consequently difficulties in external relations often result. Many mayors, city councilmen, and state legislators, as well as federal bureaucrats, are often irritated by the refusal of university experts to provide assistance. In many instances they are even more irritated when it is suggested that they should pay for such help.

The second implication of the ideological environment relates to the kind of assistance offered by the university. Universities may engage in research and publish findings which grow out of activities sponsored by

agencies other than those to whom the advice is directed. A foundation, for example, may sponsor research about the problems of providing educational services to central-city children. Out of such research may come findings that have great relevance for the educational policies being followed by central-city school boards. The response of such boards is not necessarily one of appreciation. Rather, it is considered interference and often condemned on the grounds that it comes from people who do not really understand the problems.

These various kinds of responses to the university involvement are, in part, related to the fact that we have no built-in bias in our system in favor of planning social change. The feeling is that problems should be solved but that there should be no general attack leading to widespread use of public power for the sake of long-range social planning. Yet the kind of activity in which the universities engage is often directly related to that kind of long-term concern. Those in power often respond negatively. Their positions are threatened, their decisions challenged. Most important of all, the source of the advice is impossible to control.

Because it is, in the last analysis, those in power who must be influenced if social change is to be affected, it becomes necessary to analyze what we know about the nature of power and the characteristics of the holders of that power. For if the universities are to be effective, it is these institutions and individuals who must be influenced.

Political Institutions, Power Structure, and Planning Change

Trying to determine who, in fact, governs has become a central emphasis in modern-day political science. The issue has been investigated at all levels of government and in terms of both formal and informal governing systems. At the institutional level it is quite clear that power in American government is divided and characterized by a multitude of institutional checks. The division of power among the branches of government at all levels—federal, state, and local—is often considered the unique American contribution to constitution-making.

Accompanying this horizontal division of power is the vertical division between levels of government. Although it is recognized that the old layer-cake analogy of the American governmental system is not valid and that a marble-cake comparison more closely approximates reality,

the system is still characterized by a division of power. The division between levels is not clear, but each level still possesses power of independent action and can bring to the governmental bargaining table considerable leverage.

Another division within the institutional system which has acquired new importance in the postwar period is the governmental system within metropolitan areas. These areas are characterized by a multiplicity of overlapping governmental jurisdictions, and each unit possesses limited amounts of independent power, particularly the power to block coordinated action by all the jurisdictions within the area.

This institutional system is surrounded and populated by individuals and groups seeking to use it to serve their interests. Many efforts have been made to identify these power-seekers and to measure their relative influence. Such efforts have not been completely successful and the efforts which have been made have not produced consistent answers.

At the national level various answers have been found which have identified a variety of power-possessors. These include political parties, interest groups, a conspiratorial power elite, congressional committee chairmen, and demagogic politicians. This list does not exhaust the possibilities.

There have been some contemporary efforts to explain in sweeping generalizations the present power structure of society. C. Wright Mills, for example, argues that power rests in the hands of a loose alliance of military, business, and political leaders, while James Burnham finds that power rests with a new emerging managerial elite. Even these writings and others like them, however, are not in the mainstream of contemporary social science.

The fact is that the tools of the political scientist are not sufficiently sharp to identify with precision the national power structure, particularly whether the country is dominated by a small power elite. As one student of this issue pointed out, those who know least about it write the most, and those who know the most—the participants—don't talk.

In general there appears to be a consensus among most political scientists that power at the national level is pluralistic in character, reflecting in part the institutional system. A good number of students believe that the pluralistic character of the system, except in times of great cri-

sis, stands in the way of effective government. The system, they argue, is characterized by veto groups—groups able to block action but unable to combine for positive programs.

A recent study adhering to this position is James MacGregor Burns's book, The Deadlock of Democracy: Four-Party Politics in America. Burns argues that the issues which face the country today demand vigorous positive government and that the present constellation of forces prohibits such action. Finding that our party system is a four-party system, he identifies the congressional parties as those which dominate. Representing parochial interests and possessing many members who come from one-party constituencies, these parties within Congress are not interested in positive national programs. It is the presidential parties which have national constituencies and represent a national interest. Normally hamstrung by the congressional parties, the presidential parties are unable to translate their national orientation into legislative programs.

Although a great deal remains to be learned about the interrelation of power structure and political institutions at the national level, the present system does not appear well adapted to coordinated, long-range planning.

Turning to the local level, the interaction is apparently not substantially different in its results, but more is known about the distribution of power. Although there is some disagreement about whether there is a single elite which dominates at the community level or a multiplicity of elites, the emerging consensus points in the direction of multiplicity. This pluralistic power structure at the community level may not have characterized the local system in the past, and there is no certainty that it will in the future, but the evidence indicates that it now does.

The general pattern of this pluralism seems to center around issue- or program-oriented elites which may, but do not necessarily, overlap. The influentials in one issue area are seldom exactly the same as the influentials in another area. The present system of fragmented government at the local level probably aids the perpetuation of this pattern but does not appear responsible for it, nor does it appear likely that the pattern would disappear if there were a single governing body for each metropolitan area. The influentials, in other words, are not organized in accord with political boundaries but rather around issues. The elites in

many cases attract membership from across jurisdictional lines. Many of the business leadership groups which have come into being in the last few years to aid urban redevelopment have interests and memberships which are area- rather than jurisdiction-wide.

In trying to understand the influence pattern which exists in any community, it is not only necessary to identify the decision-makers, but to understand why they possess influence. Students are attempting to discover "why" through the identification of the political resources possessed by influentials. One of the most sophisticated students in the field, Robert Dahl, has identified nine such resources: money and credit, control over jobs, control over the information of others, social standing, knowledge and expertness, popularity, legality, ethnic solidarity, and the right to vote.[1]

Possessing resources capable of influencing decision-making does not mean employing such resources fully at all times. In fact, studies made thus far indicate that except in moments of crisis, political resources are very seldom used fully. Dahl describes it this way: "Very few people seem to exploit their resources to the limit in order to influence political officials; and even political officials often have resources available to them which they do not fully use. But precisely because of the existence of these slack resources, a great many significant, abrupt, short-run changes in the distribution of influence can be brought about; for whenever someone in the community begins to exploit his available and hitherto unused resources more fully and efficiently than before, he gains markedly in influence."

This slack use of political resources not only helps to explain certain patterns of influence, but is also suggestive of opportunities for those interested in bringing about social change. It helps explain, for example, why it has been possible for public officials in some areas to exert dynamic and vigorous leadership. It also helps explain why a university study or other activity may have a sudden and significant impact.

These studies of power structure have not, of course, explained the whole phenomenon. Only a few communities have been investigated, and the results from these few have not been uniform. Further, understand-

---

1. Robert Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

ing has not progressed very far if the only conclusion reached is that power is rather widely shared. Not enough studies have been done to explain, for example, the dominance of different kinds of elites in different communities.

As with the ideological environment, the institutional system and power structure arrangement does not positively encourage social planning, but it does not absolutely prevent it, either. Before relating the relevance of this knowledge of power to university involvement in social change, it is necessary to examine the public decision-making process.

Decision-Making Process and Planning

It is with the actual decision-making process that our lack of knowledge of the causes and consequences of change plays a vital role. If the social sciences had developed into a truly predictive science, the institutional and environmental limitations on social planning would be more troublesome. We do not have, however, a predictive science. We cannot be sure that our plans will have the consequences we design them to accomplish.

In view of this limitation it is not surprising that our decision system produces decisions which introduce not large-scale and grandiose changes, but small incremental changes. Charles Lindblom has provided the most comprehensive description of the process, applying it largely to public administration but pointing out that "the incremental character of political change in the United States has often been remarked. The two major political parties agree on fundamentals; they offer alternative policies to the voters only on relatively small points of difference."

It is not surprising that this basic political characteristic is repeated at the administrative level. Students of administration have become aware in recent years of the inseparability of the political and administrative processes. Lindblom tells us further that this concentration on small incremental changes is reasonable "given the limits on knowledge within which policy-makers are confined." He argues that "simplifying by limiting the focus to small variations from present policy makes the most of available knowledge."

Incremental decision-making may, of course, produce for any particular decision unanticipated consequences. The decision-makers are

normally concerned with only one set of issues and, in their efforts to simplify the analysis of a problem, they inevitably ignore important possible consequences.

Such unanticipated consequences are not necessarily bad. For example, a political party may make a conscious effort to transfer governmental responsibilities from a lesser to a more general governmental jurisdiction, from city to county, for example. The purpose of the transfer is to protect the party's power position. It sees for itself long-run political control of the county and a possible political loss of the city. The unanticipated consequences of the movement of these functions may result in better coordinated, more economic services, although this was not the purpose of the transfer. It is, of course, just as possible that the unanticipated consequences will be less helpful.

It can be argued that the system has built-in protections against consequences which violate important values held by any significant part of the community. Since all interests are free to organize and to use their resources to protect their interests, it is possible that even when all consequences are not considered by the actual decision-maker, others will be aware of them and will use their influence to either redress the damage done or alter or stop the action before the decision is made.

Granting the general accuracy of this picture does not necessitate concluding that the best possible policy or planning emerges from the process. The system obviously has a negative bias. It is easier to stop action than to initiate it. Further, it assumes a kind of equality of political influence for different interests which is highly unlikely, or it assumes that present distribution of political resources is the "right" distribution.

As with the ideological environment and the institutional and power system, the decision process in both its administrative and political dimensions does not lend itself to large-scale social planning. The most significant aspect of the decision system is its inability to produce decisions which accomplish more than small incremental changes.

The Relationship of University Involvement to the Power System and Decision-Making

The power-structure system provides many points of access for universities. Since the power structure is not monolithic, it is possible

for universities, through their many activities, to find points in the system where they can get a hearing. Politicians searching for issues and for solutions to problems will go to whoever will give advice and help.

These points of access, however, do not solve the problem of the translation of university research findings into public policy. There are few individuals on either the university or government side who are capable of playing this intermediary role. More and more of the problems which face society are of a kind which require deep and substantive research for solution. Yet often the findings which grow out of highly technical and often abstract university research cannot be automatically applied to many of the problems as they are seen by the politician.

Individuals, however, may be emerging on both sides who can play this translating role. For government there are public officials who are sufficiently intellectually curious to take university research and translate it into policy alternatives; or they may have staffs who are able to do that for them. At the same time within our universities there are a few scholars who are adept at this art. In fact, there is a steady stream of academic types into and out of government who play this role directly.

Since there are many access points in the system, it follows that the university scholar serves a great variety of masters and interests; even individuals within the same university may be giving different advice to different public officials. Such a practice is consistent with the pluralism of American society, and just as the public power-structure side is not monolithic, neither is the university side. There is no university position relative to specific social issues; rather there are findings of university scholars which may be used by those in power to advance the solutions which they think are best.

In many ways the resulting university role is not completely satisfying to any of the participants. The university scholar is not in a position of immediate power and influence but must play a secondary role. Further, since the power system is pluralistic, the acceptance of the scholar's solutions by one part of the system does not ensure their acceptance by another. This situation leads to a great deal of frustration on the part of the scholar. Equally, the advice which flows from the university to the outside world is not all consistent, and this leads the man in the street to wonder whether university people know anything at all.

The incremental system of decision-making which characterizes American public life is also frustrating to the scholar. He likes to tackle problems whole and come up with complete solutions. Seldom are the solutions he proposes accepted in exactly the way he states them. Rather, they are modified; and sometimes they are combined with what he thinks are inconsistent measures suggested by others.

This incremental process of public decision-making is the other side of the pluralistic power system. They both create frustrations for university people and cause a good number of students to throw up their hands in despair and withdraw to their studies. Equally, university demands that fundamental solutions be tried cause public officials to distrust university advisors.

This difficulties grow out of the inherent characteristics of the American system, but the fact is that the politician is more and more dependent on substantive experts. His relationship to such scholars because of their independence may frighten him, yet he must use them. There have been attempts by people in the public sector to get around this problem by establishing in-house research operations. This process will continue, but in the last analysis it will have to be the universities which provide the kind of assistance needed. It is the very independence that the government official dislikes that makes the university attractive to the scholar. Even organizations like the Rand Corporation cannot provide the independence and the openness of the university.

There must continue to be, therefore, university involvement in social change. The necessary relationships with the public sector will never be completely happy, and perhaps that is as it should be. Tension itself has advantages. For the university administrator, however, who must deal with local and state and national governmental agencies on a day-to-day basis, this long-run view is not particularly comforting. The trouble which his scholars cause him will undoubtedly continue to create unhappiness. By the same token, the public official who must use the university scholar will probably never be completely at ease with him. Neat solutions to these internal tensions are simply not possible. They are an inevitable part of the system.